## SENIOR EMPLOYMENT SERVICES COORDINATION PLAN

# Virginia Department For The Aging Commonwealth Of Virginia

## **Program Year 2004**

### Introduction to the Plan

The Virginia Department for the Aging (VDA), which administers the state's Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), is responsible for taking the lead role to complete an annual *State Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan (State Plan)*. This plan is required by the amended and reauthorized Older Americans Act (OAA) of 2000, signed into law by the President on November 13, 2000. The OAA amendments established a new planning process for SCSEP programs that provides for widespread involvement of interested individuals and groups in developing an annual plan.

SCSEP is the only federally sponsored job creation program targeted to low-income older Americans. The program subsidizes part-time community service jobs for low-income persons age 55 years and older who have poor employment prospects. The program fosters economic self-sufficiency by moving able participants into unsubsidized employment in the public and private sectors. Program enrollees work in a wide variety of community service jobs, including nurse's aides, teacher aides, librarians and clerical workers. The program benefits both participants and communities they serve.

SCSEP, authorized by Title V of the OAA, is administered at the federal level by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). DOL allocates funds to operate the program to state agencies on aging in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the territories and awards funds based on open competition to thirteen national contractor organizations or sponsors. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the state funding share is administered by VDA. National sponsor organizations operating SCSEP in Virginia are the AARP Foundation, Experience Works, Inc., U. S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, and the National Asian Pacific Center on Aging, Inc. A unique feature of Virginia's program is that VDA, in addition to operating the state grant,

contracts with one national sponsor, The National Council On The Aging, Inc. (NCOA), to operate that sponsor's program in the Commonwealth.

DOL decided last year, for the first time, to conduct an open competition for the SCSEP national sponsor funds. Existing national contractors competed with new organizations resulting in an increase, on July 1, 2004, in the number of national grantees nationwide from ten to thirteen. National sponsors operating in Virginia, however, were reduced from six to the five noted above. This major shift in direction by DOL resulted in a significant redistribution of funds and service areas nationwide. In Virginia, the past year has been one of transition as adjustments have been made to the new configuration. Transfer of program participants among sponsors to accommodate the new assignments, adjusting to the loss of service areas where relationships and productive networks had been established, and assuming new service areas have challenged Virginia's SCSEP network over the past year.

## Section I. Plan Participation

The new planning process envisions broad participation of interested individuals and groups in developing an annual plan. To insure the involvement of interested organizations, VDA shared a copy of the state plan procedures and the draft plan with organizations outlined in Section 2 below through meetings, conference calls, faxes, mail, and e-mail. The State Plan was posted on VDA's web site and made available for review and comment through a public comment process.

## Section 2. Involvement of Organizations and Individuals

VDA, the Commonwealth of Virginia's SCSEP grantee, initiated actions to involve as many organizations as possible during the limited time available for the preparation of this plan. VDA convened a meeting of all of Virginia's national sponsor organizations in January, 2004 to discuss equitable distribution and the State Plan. At that time, the limited information and direction received from DOL was shared. In March, 2004

national contractor organizations operating in Virginia were informed by email memorandum of DOL's recent Older Worker Bulletin 01-04, outlining its State Plan requirements. National contractors also provided data for Section 4 of the state plan and were surveyed for additional information and recommendations for the plan during March, 2004. National contractors, state staff, AAA representatives, and other stakeholders convened by conference call to discuss the draft plan during May, 2004.

Virginia's Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) and four Workforce Investment Act (WIA) One-Stop Center and Workforce Investment Board staff representatives were involved through discussion at a statewide workshop for SCSEP Title V Coordinators on October 23 and 24, 2003. AAA and WIA representatives also participated in the meeting of national contractors and state staff to discuss the draft plan.

A broad range of interested parties and stakeholders were notified by email of the State Plan process and invited to submit comments and recommendations. Recipients included Virginia's area agencies on aging network that operates Title III of the OAA Amendments, state SCSEP sub-projects, national sponsor grantees operating in Virginia, the Workforce Investment Act division of the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC), the divisions of the Virginia Department of Social Services that provide services to older workers, the Virginia Council Against Poverty that represents community based organizations, the division of the Virginia Department of Business Assistance that provides training to new and expanding businesses, the Virginia AFL-CIO, and academic organizations with an interest in older workers. All recipients were requested to forward the email to their respective field offices, state or local boards, and any other affected organizations and individuals, including participants and underserved older individuals that were deemed appropriate. Recipients were informed that the State Plan would be posted on the VDA web site for public comments prior to submission to DOL. Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) also were made aware of the State Plan process by SCSEP national contractor and aging network staff serving on WIBs.

Two WIB members representing SCSEP Title V on their respective boards were invited to participate in the meeting of national contractors and state staff referenced above. The WIA division of the VEC also was invited to participate in the meeting and was asked to forward the State Plan public comment notification to the WIB network.

### **Section 3. Public Comments**

VDA made a copy of the State Plan available for public comments on its web site for a two week period. Email notification of the posting was made to all interested parties and stakeholders referenced in Section 2. No public comments were received.

#### Section 4. State Plan Provisions

#### a. Basic Distribution of SCSEP Positions within the State

DOL's Older Worker Bulletin 03-06, requests an equitable distribution report be prepared annually showing the distribution of Title V SCSEP enrollee positions among all political jurisdictions (independent cities and counties) in each state. VDA has the responsibility for the actual preparation and submission of the report to DOL; however, this is a collaborative effort and VDA holds an equitable distribution meeting each year involving all SCSEP grantees in Virginia. This report provides the basic information needed to assess the location of the eligible population and the current distribution of SCSEP enrollees served by the state program (VDA) and national contractor organizations within the state.

Equitable distribution is the process for distributing SCSEP enrollee positions so that all eligible persons (55 + and 125% of poverty or below) have reasonably equal geographical access to SCSEP. In the Commonwealth, VDA and the five (5) national sponsors operating in the state, collectively receive grant funds for 1,308 enrollee positions.

The collection of data and preparation of the report are for the purpose of determining how equitably positions are distributed throughout the state and to initiate progress towards equitable distribution where needed. It provides a means for deciding where to locate new or vacant positions.

The Commonwealth of Virginia's equitable distribution (ED) report was compiled from SCSEP enrollee data submitted from all SCSEP program grantees operating in the state (VDA's state-administered program including NCOA and four national contractor organizations). These data show the number of current SCSEP enrollees residing in each city and county in the state. The report compares residency of current enrollees to a computed equitable share for each county and city in the state. The computed equitable share, provided by DOL, was based on 2000 census data showing the number of people age 55 and over and below 125 percent of the Health and Human Services poverty level by county and state. A copy of Virginia's ED report is included in Attachment I.

DOL instructed states this year in Older Worker Bulletin No. 01-04 to provide a detailed plan for moving positions from overserved to underserved areas and expressed the expectation that both the national and state grantees move positions to correct inequities. DOL emphasized that disruptions must be avoided and recommended that all grantees gradually shift positions and encourage employment to make positions available for eligible individuals in areas where there has been an increase in the eligible population.

SCSEP grantees, at their annual meeting in January, 2004, compared equitable service levels with the actual distribution and discussed how to bring about an improved distribution. During the discussion, the following points were made and provided the basis for further deliberation on movement of slots:

 There is lack of clarity among national contractor organizations and the state program on what DOL intended grantees to use as the basis for ED reporting: authorized slot assignments made by DOL or planned by the grantee and outlined in the grant; actual jurisdictional residencies of individuals enrolled at the time of the ED data gathering; a report based on a review of residency of individuals over a three month period; or a report based on a typical distribution. There is concern that reporting is not uniform among grantees and a recommendation was made that DOL clarify its expectations.

- The fluid nature of enrollment and limitations of current ED reporting needs to be recognized. ED data may not accurately depict services. For example, during the course of a year, 3 or 4 residents of the same jurisdiction may be served. If, however, at the time of the ED report, none of the residents of that jurisdiction are enrolled, the jurisdiction appears underserved, when, in fact, it is not.
- DOL's role in creating the situation in Richmond City that led to over service needs to be recognized. A number of years back, DOL allowed Urban League to begin serving Richmond City when it was already equitably served by the state and AARP programs.
- There is political pressure to increase or maintain community service slots in some county or city governments; e.g., mayors' offices.
- There is political pressure to maintain "home-steaders" in certain work sites.
   Removal would invite lack of cooperation from local organizations upon whom the local agency depends.
- Waiting lists of individuals seeking Title V services exist in some areas that the
  data indicate are "overserved"; conversely, recruitment problems exist in some
  areas that the data indicate are supposedly "underserved".
- There are certain jurisdictions, particularly in rural areas, where in spite of aggressive recruitment efforts, eligible individuals are not interested in the

program. Citizens residing in these areas tend to be suspicious of government services, are strongly self-reliant, and when in need they depend on family.

Virginia's grantees unanimously agreed that to avoid further disruptions to enrollees and to maintain the program stability necessary to operate quality programs, a gradual transfer of positions over a reasonable length of time was the only prudent way to approach slot transfers. The Commonwealth's plan for making progress toward ED is included in Attachment II.

## b. Rural and Urban Populations

DOL requested states to provide information about the relative distribution of individuals residing in rural and urban areas within the state. DOL instructed states (the Governor or his/her designee) to decide how the information is to be displayed and the approach to be used. VDA, the Governor's designee, decided to present this information on a statewide basis.

Table 1 details the rural-urban composition of Virginia's older population, age 55 and over. While 51.8 percent of Virginia's total population resides in rural areas (based on the Census Bureau's "urban area" definition), a slightly higher percentage (52.5 percent) of the population age 55 and over also live in rural areas of the state.

Table 1. Rural and Urban Populations, Age 55 and Over, Virginia 2000

				TC	TAL PERS	ONS			
	All Ages	55 to 59 years	60 - 64 years	65 - 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 to 79 years	80 to 84 years	85 years and over	55 & Over
	7,								
Virginia	078,515	358,442	273,169	229,553	202,903	166,178	106,433	87,266	1,926,666
RURAL SUB-TOTAL	3,667,294	205,337	151,405	119,436	99,292	77,506	49,009	38,484	1,011,310
URBAN SUB-TOTAL	3,411,221	153,105	121,764	110,117	103,611	88,672	57,424	48,782	915,356
Percent of Total which is Rural	51.8%	57.3%	55.4%	52.0%	48.9%	46.6%	46.0%	44.1%	52.5%
Percentage of Total Population in Age Group	100.0%	5.1%	3.9%	3.2%	2.9%	2.3%	1.5%	1.2% -	27.2%

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 1, Table P12. Urban area and urban cluster data were aggregated by VDA to compute urban area total by age group and the rural component for each group was derived by subtracting the urban total from the total population.

Special tabulation data provided by the US Department of Labor provide more insight into the urban and rural distribution of current and future SCSEP target populations, as reflected in Table 2. Nearly 40 percent of the persons age 45 and over in 2000 living at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level resided in rural areas of the state. Almost 74 percent of these older poor rural residents were white, and virtually all of the remaining poor older population was black. Older poor persons of other races collectively represented less than 2 percent of the older rural population.

Table 2. All persons <u>45 years and older</u>, (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels.

Virginia	Total	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaskan Native alone	Asian alone	Some other race alone	Two or more races	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino
Virginia Total	279,710	178,615	88,200	855	6,095	1,870	4,045	5,845	273,865
Urban and Rural:									
Urban	168,910	96,785	60,760	615	5,880	1,715	3,135	5,065	163,845
Rural	110,795	81,835	27,440	240	215	155	910	775	110,020
Pct of Total (%)	39.6	29.2	9.8	<.01	<.01	<.01	.32	.27	39.3
Pct of Rural Total %)	100.0	73.9	24.8	.21	.19	.13	.82	.70	99.3

**Source:** 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 3. Note: Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander race group omitted due to suppression of data in source table.

In future years VDA will determine the availability of a data source that show the distribution of SCSEP's target population, those aged 55 years and older and at or below 125% of HHS poverty levels, in rural and urban areas within the Commonwealth. A comparison then can be made between the urban and rural distribution of the SCSEP target group compared to actual distribution of SCSEP participant slots allocated to urban and rural areas of the Commonwealth.

## c. Special Populations

The amended Older Americans Act requires information about the relative distribution of eligible individuals with the greatest economic needs, eligible individuals who are minorities, and eligible individuals with the greatest social needs. DOL has defined these terms and instructed states (the Governor or his/her designee) to decide how the information is to be displayed. VDA decided to present this information on a statewide basis.

## **Greatest Economic Need and Minority Distribution**

"Greatest economic need", as defined by DOL, means those persons at or below the poverty level established by the Department of Health and Human Services and approved by OMB.

"Minorities" are defined by DOL as those persons that identify themselves as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asians, Black or African Americans, Hispanic or Latino Americans (including white Hispanics), and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders.

Table 3. Persons 55 and Older by Poverty Status, Virginia

	1989	1999
Income in 1989/1999 above poverty level	994,573	1,262,777
Income in 1989/1999 below poverty level	130,354	117,156
TOTAL	1,124,927	1,379,933
Per Cent Below 100% Poverty Level	11.59%	8.5%

Sources: 1990 Census of Population and Housing – Special Tabulation on Aging, (CD90 – AOA3 - 2, Table P367). 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 4, Table PCT 142.

Table 3 shows that 8.5 percent of Virginians 55 or over had incomes at or below the poverty level, based on 2000 census data. Table 3 also indicates that the trend over the last decade has been a decline in the number of older persons living at or below the poverty level.

Table 4. Minority<sup>1</sup> Persons 55 and Older by Poverty Status, Virginia

	1989	1999
All Minorities above poverty level	159,043	231,472
All Minorities below poverty level	47,414	46,130
TOTAL	206,457	277,602
Per Cent Below 100% Poverty level	22.97%	16.6%

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing - Special Tabulation on Aging, (CD90 – AOA3 – 2, Table P44). 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Summary File 4, Table PCT 142.

Table 4 shows that 16.6 percent of Virginians 55 or older who were at or below the poverty level were minorities, based on 2000 census data. Older minority populations participated in the decade trend of declining rates of poverty.

Table 5. All Persons 55 years and older, Virginia (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels.

Population 55 and Over By State	2000 C	ensus
and Race and Ethnicity	Total 55 +	Pct. Of Total 55+ (%)
Virginia	200,775	100.0
Race:		
White alone	133,035	66.3
Black or African American alone	60,570	30.2
American Indian and Alaskan Native alone	465	.2
Asian alone	3,630	1.8
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	14	<.01
Some other race alone	725	.36
Two or more races	2,330	1.2
Hispanic Origin:		
Hispanic or Latino	2,780	1.4
Not Hispanic or Latino	197,990	98.6

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 2.

Table 5 depicts the racial and ethnic (i.e., Hispanic status) composition of Virginia's 55 and older population living at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level. About two-thirds of this group was white, and another 30 percent were black. About 1.5 percent of this population was Hispanic or Latino.

According to the 2000 Census, as depicted in Tables 3 and 5, there were 200,775 individuals in the Commonwealth who were aged 55 and older and whose incomes were at 125 percent of the poverty level and below. Of this total, 117,156 individuals were at or below the poverty level. Thus, 58 percent of the SCSEP eligible population in the Commonwealth was determined to have the greatest economic need.

For the year ending June 30, 2003, Virginia's grantees (VDA and six national sponsor organizations) reported 1,159 participants currently enrolled in SCSEP programs in the Commonwealth. Of those, 960 participants or 83 percent were at or below the poverty level. The percent of participants served (83 percent) by Virginia grantees in the Commonwealth that were at of below the poverty level exceeds the statewide percentage (58 percent) of eligible individuals at or below the poverty level. This indicates that those with the greatest economic need are being reached with available funding.

According to the 2000 Census, and as depicted in Table 5, there were 67,459 minorities residing in the Commonwealth eligible for the SCSEP program. This minority population represented 33.5 percent of the eligible SCSEP population of 200,775.

Virginia's SCSEP grantees reported 616 minority individuals currently enrolled in SCSEP programs as of June 30, 2003. This represents 53 percent of the total individuals (1,159) enrolled at that time. Minorities enrolled in the Commonwealth's SCSEP program almost double the minority representation in the eligible population. This is an indication of the Commonwealth's success in reaching and serving the minority population.

## **Greatest Social Need**

"Greatest social need", as defined by DOL, means needs caused by non-economic factors. It includes persons with physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and cultural, social, or geographic isolation, including isolation brought about by racial or ethnic status.

To determine greatest social need this year, VDA used data on persons with disabilities, limited English proficiency (LEP), minorities, and veterans. Limited data prevented a full assessment of greatest social need; this section will expand in the future when more data becomes available.

Table 6. Disability Status of Virginians Age 55 and 45 and over, (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels

Disability Status	Total 55 +	Percent of Total	Percent of Total	
Total Persons:	200,770	100.0%	279,710	100.0%
With a disability	121,410	60.5%	158,205	56.6%
No disability	79,360	39.5%	121,505	43.4%

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 3.

Table 6 depicts the disability status of the SCSEP target population, persons age 55 and over at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level. Almost two-thirds (60.5 percent) of this population classified themselves as having a disability.

As of June 30, 2003, 14.6 percent of participants currently enrolled by all grantees in Virginia had identified themselves as disabled. Grantees will, in future years, evaluate available data on the disabled population, review data produced by the new DOL participant data collection and reporting system and determine if there are ways to increase the participation of the eligible disabled population.

Table 7. Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English of Virginians Age 45 and over, (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels

Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English:	Total	White alone	Black or African American alone	Asian alone	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino	
Total Persons	279,710	178,615	88,200	6,095	5,845	273,865	
Speaks only English	259,780	169,735	86,075	470	1,160	258,620	
Speaks English "very well" or "well"	12,025	6,180	1,770	2,525	1,925	10,100	
Speaks English "not well" or "not at all"	7,900	2,705	350	3,100	2,760	5,145	
Percent that speaks English "not well" or "not at all"	2.8%	1.5%	0.4%	50.9%	47.2%	1.9%	

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 3. Note: Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander race group omitted due to suppression of data in source table. Native American and Alaskan Native race group omitted here due to comparatively small population reported.

Table 7 summarizes the "social isolation" of persons age 45 and over at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level, as measured by the number and percent of the total population that does not speak English at home either "well" or "at all". While only 2.8 percent of the total target population has this limitation, among Hispanic and Asian groups, the percent of the population with English-speaking limitations approaches or exceeds 50 percent of the population.

Beginning on July 1, 2004, DOL will implement new SCSEP data collection and reporting requirements. Grantees will collect data on limited English proficiency of participants. Even though grantees serve considerable numbers of LEP enrollees in certain regions of the state, data are not available on which to base a comparison with incidence in the population. In future years we will be able to compare the percentage of LEP participants served to the percentage of LEP eligible SCSEP individuals.

Table 8. Veterans Status of Virginians Age 55 and 45 and over, (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels

Veterans Status	Total 55 +	Percent of Total	Persons 45+ in 2000	Percent of Total
Total Persons	200,765	100.0%	279,705	100.0%
Civilian veteran	28,015	14.0%	38,325	13.7%
Non-veteran	172,750	86.0%	241,380	86.3%

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 3.

Table 8 depicts the veterans status of the SCSEP target population, persons age 55 and over at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level. Only 14 percent of this population is classified as veterans.

As of June 30, 2003, of the total SCSEP participants currently enrolled by all grantees, 118 or 10 percent were veterans. During the next year SCSEP grantees plan to increase outreach to serve more veterans and qualified spouses.

VDA and the five national grantees operating in the Commonwealth will strive to assure that special populations have adequate access to employment services offered under SCSEP. In future years, the number of veterans and qualified spouses aged 60 and older will continue to be a priority for SCSEP grantees as required by the Jobs for Veterans Act of November 2002. Special consideration will be given to eligible individuals with greatest economic need, poor employment history or prospects, those who have the greatest social and/or economic need, eligible minorities and limited English speakers. As more data becomes available from both special census tabulations and DOL's new data base, VDA and the national grantees serving the Commonwealth will closely assess service to special populations and adjust plans accordingly.

## d. Types of Skills

The OAA requires that the State Plan address the employment situations and the types of skills possessed by the SCSEP target population. Eligible individuals in this target group are low-income individuals 55 or older residing in the state.

Table 9. Employment Status, by Race and Ethnicity, of Persons age 45 and over (excluding those in the Armed Forces), at or below 125% of HHS Poverty Levels

Virginia	Total	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaskan Native alone	Asian alone	Some other race alone	Two or more races	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino
Virginia Total	279,710	178,615	88,200	855	6,095	1,870	4,045	5,845	273,865
Employment Status:									
Civilian Employed	45,070	27,160	14,275	180	1,695	750	1,005	2,115	42,960
Unemployed	7,940	4,405	3,020	100	160	95	160	265	7,675
Not in labor force	226,695	147,050	70,900	580	4,235	1,025	2,880	3,465	223,235
Pct Unemployed	2.8%	2.5%	3.4%	11.7%	2.6%	5.1%	4.0%	4.5%	2.8%

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Special Tabulation: Senior Community Service Employment Program Data provided by US Department of Labor, Table 3. Note: Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander race group omitted due to suppression of data in source table.

Unemployment rates are one indicator of the general employment situations for the SCSEP eligible population. Table 9 depicts the employment status of the older population (45 years and over) living at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty level. Overall unemployment in this group was 2.8 percent, with unemployment rates for the black population 36 percent higher than their white counterparts. The highest unemployment rate (11.7 percent) is observed in the comparatively small, American Indian/Native Alaskan population group.

Potential data sources are being researched to determine if data are available to determine types of skills SCSEP eligible individuals possess. We are investigating the

feasibility of building a profile of occupational skills and employment status of those 45 and over looking for work. The data source may become available when the 2000 census special tabulation on aging is released. Other future methods of collecting and measuring this data include surveying WIBs, an informal assessment by grantees, and identifying job openings geared specifically towards the skills sets of the SCSEP eligible population.

## e. Community Service Needs

The OAA requires that the State Plan identify the localities and populations where community service projects are most needed. Community service means social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services, and library, recreational, conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and other services essential and necessary to the community as the state may determine. SCSEP enrollees work 20 hours per week in various community service training sites while enrolled in the program and prior to being placed into unsubsidized employment.

The VDA, through its AAA and WIB service providers, and the five national sponsor contractors operating in the Commonwealth identify the types of community services that are needed locally and then determine the places where those services are most needed. We believe the task of identifying the types of community services that are needed and the places where these services are most needed is best left at the local level where there is a better understanding of each community's unique needs. The Commonwealth of Virginia is diverse and its community service needs vary significantly from locality to locality. The ability to make local determinations is of paramount importance as the five national sponsor organizations and VDA, through its network, work collaboratively with WIA partners and other human services agencies in their respective communities to meet the needs of participants that are most in need. In future years, a summary of Virginia's community service assignments will be available from DOL's new reporting system and will be provided as part of this report.

### f. Coordination with the Workforce Investment Act

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, passed into law on August 7, 1998, provides the framework for a workforce preparation and employment system designed to meet both the needs of the nation's businesses and the needs of job seekers and those who want to further their careers. Federally funded employment programs formerly authorized under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) were redesigned under the WIA. It reformed the existing employment and training system and mandated a coordinated and integrated service delivery system for employment and training services through delivery of services at nation-wide One-Stop Centers.

WIA streamlines the numerous federal employment programs and provides states and localities with more discretion to design and monitor workforce development strategies to meet their own labor market needs. WIA emphasizes universal access to programs and services. It eliminates specific targeting for certain populations including older workers. Instead, it encourages state and local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBS), the local governing boards, to develop integrated systems and One-Stop centers that best meet the needs of their areas. Older workers and SCSEP are now considered part of the overall workforce development system.

The WIA included SCSEP as a required partner in the One-Stop delivery system to ensure that older workers have access to information about the range of employment-related services available to them. The OAA Amendments built on that partnership by requiring that all SCSEP grantees in an area coordinate their activities through the One-Stop delivery system. As a One-Stop partner, SCSEP programs must provide core services through the One-Stop system, contribute toward the maintenance of the One-Stop system, enter into a memorandum of understanding with the local WIB relating to

the operation of the One-Stop system, and participate in the operation of the system. A representative of SCSEP grantees must also be a member of the local board.

Recent gubernatorial and legislative work force reform initiatives have reinforced the importance of active partnerships between WIA and other workforce development programs. Governor Mark Warner, in 2003, proposed legislative reforms to create a coordinated statewide workforce development system in the Commonwealth. The legislation was passed by the General Assembly and became effective July 1, 2003. The Governor's new workforce legislation directed numerous agencies in three secretariats to become active partners in the Virginia Workforce Network, the revised One-Stop system of workforce centers. This led to the development of a WIA State partner Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed in February, 2004, by the Secretaries of Health and Human Resources, Education, and Commerce and Trade. The MOU sets forth the terms of agreement for cooperation and consultation with regard to the implementation of the WIA in Virginia and provides a model for local MOU preparation. The agencies and programs listed in the MOU, one of which was the SCSEP administered by VDA, were charged with collaborating to support the workforce investment system operated through the one-stop centers at local levels.

As a required partner in the One-Stop delivery system, Virginia's SCSEP has, since WIA inception, taken actions to coordinate SCSEP activities with WIA and find ways to better serve participants and will continue to do so.

In Virginia, a variety of collaborative measures have been taken across the state to develop and improve coordination with WIA. They are as follows:

- Co-location of SCSEP staff at One-Stop centers on a part-time basis
- Placement of SCSEP enrollees at One-Stop centers serves as work site for the enrollee and provides an in-kind contribution toward the maintenance of the One-Stop system locally

- SCSEP staff serve as local WIB members
- Attendance of SCSEP staff at WIB meetings
- Participation on local planning groups with other mandated One-Stop partners
- Referral of Title V SCSEP enrollees to One-Stop centers for employment and training services
- Development, negotiation, and execution of Memoranda of Understanding between SCSEP grantees and One-Stop centers
- Older Worker Specialist Curriculum designed to train One-Stop staff to assist older workers distributed to SCSEP programs throughout state
- Annual meeting of all SCSEP grantees in the state for the last two years to discuss ways to coordinate with WIA
- Local SCSEP staff Involvement in on-going regional planning meetings to plan One-Stop operations
- Integration of employment and training services for older workers at the local level in selected areas, e.g., reaching agreement for Title V enrollees to be automatically eligible for WIA services.
- Providing a forum for information exchange among local SCSEP practitioners.
- Educating local WIB staff on SCSEP and vice-versa to increase prospects of service integration - this understanding is vital to the process
- Increased communication among SCSEP state and national contractor grantees operating in the same locality
- Several local SCSEP sub-projects are operated by WIBS
- Dual enrollment of participants in SCSEP and WIA when appropriate

Future steps to improve coordination include:

- Providing more opportunities for SCSEP practitioners around the state to exchange best practices information regarding successes with coordination with WIA
- Request WIA participation in SCSEP statewide and local conferences and workshops
- Encourage integrated planning between SCSEP and WIA
- Providing leadership to the field in implementing provisions of the State MOU

## g. Avoidance of Disruptions

DOL requested states to describe steps that will be taken to avoid disruptions when new Census data indicates there has been a shift in the location of the eligible population or when there is over-enrollment for any other reason.

Our first obligation, as always, is to the participant. When over-enrollment exists, Virginia's State program and national sponsor programs are committed to gradually shifting positions to underserved areas as attrition occurs. This is reflected in Virginia's ED plan that is attached to this document.

### Section 5. Plan Recommendations

While, in many respects, the SCSEP in operating smoothly throughout the Commonwealth, there are opportunities for improvement. Adjustments to systemic changes that occurred during the past year and the implementation of final SCSEP regulations on July 1, 2004 present new challenges to Virginia's grantees. To meet these challenges and improve SCSEP services, we propose to:

Increase information sharing among VDA and national sponsor program
grantees regarding approaches to working more effectively with WIA partners to
better serve participants.

- Convene all Virginia SCSEP grantees in the fall of 2004 to begin evaluating progress toward meeting equitable distribution goals proposed in Virginia's plan.
- Explore ways to secure data and improve analysis of services provided to SCSEP eligible special populations.

## SCSEP Equitable Distribution Report - PY 2004 Commonwealth of Virginia

### **REVISION 1**

REVISION 1	Distribution	Equitable								
County	Factor	Share	State	AARP	EW	NAPCA	NCOA	USFS	Totals	Diff.
Accomack County, VA	0.0127	16	5		13				18	2
Albemarle County, VA	0.0081	11	3		8				11	0
Alexandria city, VA	0.0124	16				1	27		28	12
Alleghany County, VA	0.0049	6			1		3	6	10	4
Amelia County, VA	0.0026	3	1		1				2	-1
Amherst County, VA	0.0081	11					2	2	4	-7
Appomattox County, VA	0.0042	6			5				5	-1
Arlington County, VA	0.0154	20				3	14	2	19	-1
Augusta County, VA	0.0108	14			1			11	12	-2
Bath County, VA	0.0009	1						4	4	3
Bedford city, VA	0.0021	3			1				1	-2
Bedford County, VA	0.0097	13			9			3	12	-1
Bland County, VA	0.0024	3	2		2				4	1
Botetourt County, VA	0.0042	5					3	2	5	0
Bristol city, VA	0.0060	8	1		6				7	-1
Brunswick County, VA	0.0063	8	3		5				8	0
Buchanan County, VA	0.0093	12					13		13	1
Buckingham County, VA	0.0049	6	1		4				5	-1
Buena Vista city, VA	0.0017	2			·			3	3	1
Campbell County, VA	0.0106	14			8		6		14	0
Caroline County, VA	0.0047	6	2				Ť		2	-4
Carroll County, VA	0.0091	12	2		10				12	0
Charles City County, VA	0.0014	2	3		10				3	1
Charlotte County, VA	0.0014	7	3		5				8	1
	0.0051	7	5		6				11	4
Charlottesville city, VA Chesapeake city, VA	0.0095	25	5	15	0				15	-10
			3						18	0
Chesterfield County, VA Clarke County, VA	0.0139 0.0023	18 3	1	15					1	-2
		3	1						1	-2
Colonial Heights city, VA	0.0020		'					-		4
Covington city, VA	0.0019	2					1	5	6	3
Craig County, VI	0.0010	1 -7						4	4	,
Culpeper County, VA	0.0051	7	6		5				11	4
Cumberland County, VA	0.0023	3	1		2				3	0
Danville city, VA	0.0165	22	10		13				23	1
Dickenson County, VA	0.0058	8					5	1	6	-2
Dinwiddie County, VA	0.0047	6	1						1	-5
Emporia city, VA	0.0028	4	1		2				3	-1
Essex County, VA	0.0028	4	1		3				4	0
Fairfax city, VA	0.0018	2					1		1	-1
Fairfax County, VA	0.0409	53				23	20		43	-10
Falls Church city, VA	0.0006	1					1		1	0
Fauquier County, VA	0.0067	9	1						1	-8
Floyd County, VA	0.0040	5	1		4				5	0
Fluvanna County, VA	0.0026	3	2		2				4	1

	Distribution	Equitable								
County	Factor	Share	State	AARP	EW	NAPCA	NCOA	USFS	Totals	Diff.
Franklin city, VA	0.0028	4			3		4		7	3
Franklin County, VA	0.0101	13	3		9				12	-1
Frederick County, VA	0.0070	9	4						4	-5
Fredericksburg city, VA	0.0025	3	2						2	-1
Galax city, VA	0.0026	3	5		1				6	3
Giles County, VA	0.0039	5	2		4			1	7	2
Gloucester County, VA	0.0055	7	6		5				11	4
Goochland County, VA	0.0025	3	1						1	-2
Grayson County, VA	0.0063	8	6		6				12	4
Greene County, VA	0.0017	2	1		2				3	1
Greensville County, VA	0.0030	4	1		3				4	0
Halifax County, VA	0.0146	19	5		15				20	1
Hampton city, VA	0.0177	23		23					23	0
Hanover County, VA	0.0069	9	4						4	-5
Harrisonburg city, VA	0.0049	6			2			4	6	0
Henrico County, VA	0.0266	35	9	27					36	1
Henry County, VA	0.0137	18	9		9			-	18	0
Highland County, VA	0.0008	1			1				1	0
Hopewell city, VA	0.0045	6	2						2	-4
Isle of Wight County, VA	0.0049	6			1		5		6	0
James City County, VA	0.0055	7					1		1	-6
King and Queen County, VA	0.0019	3	1		3				4	1
King George County, VA	0.0021	3	1						1	-2
King William County, VA	0.0019	2	1		3				4	2
Lancaster County, VA	0.0041	5	2		2				4	-1
Lee County, VA	0.0105	14	8		10				18	4
Lexington city, VA	0.0015	2						2	2	0
Loudoun County, VA	0.0063	8	2						2	-6
Louisa County, VA	0.0052	7	1		6				7	0
Lunenburg County, VA	0.0052	7	2		5				7	0
Lynchburg city, VA	0.0164	21					20		20	-1
Madison County, VA	0.0026	3	1		1				2	-1
Manassas city, VA	0.0022	3					1		1	-2
Manassas Park city, VA	0.0005	1					1		1	0
Martinsville city, VA	0.0069	9	4		3				7	-2
Mathews County, VA	0.0012	2			2				2	0
Mecklenburg County, VA	0.0114	15	8		10				18	3
Middlesex County, VA	0.0027	4	2		4				6	2
Montgomery County, VA	0.0089	12	0		4			6	10	-2
Nelson County, VA	0.0034	5	2		3				5	0
New Kent County, VA	0.0014	2	2						2	0
Newport News city, VA	0.0238	31		28			3		31	0
Norfolk city, VA	0.0391	51		58			7		65	14
Northampton County, VA	0.0052	7	4		5				9	2
Northumberland County, VA	0.0035	5	1		5				6	1
Norton city, VA	0.0014	2	2		1				3	1
Nottoway County, VA	0.0056	7	4		4				8	1
Orange County, VA	0.0063	8	1		3				4	-4
Stange County, VA	0.0000	J			J				-	•

County	Distribution Factor	Equitable Share	State	AARP	EW	NAPCA	NCOA	USFS	Totals	Diff.
Page County, VA	0.0065	8	3					5	8	0
Patrick County, VA	0.0062	8	3		6				9	1
Petersburg city, VA	0.0103	13	10	6					16	3
Pittsylvania County, VA	0.0172	22	7		17				24	2
Poquoson city, VA	0.0012	2							0	-2
Portsmouth city, VA	0.0188	25		17					17	-8
Powhatan County, VA	0.0019	3	1						1	-2
Prince Edward County, VA	0.0054	7	3		2				5	-2
Prince George County, VA	0.0030	4	1						1	-3
Prince William County, VA	0.0112	15					4		4	-11
Pulaski County, VA	0.0083	11	10		6				16	5
Radford city, VA	0.0017	2	1		1			1	3	1
Rappahannock County, VA	0.0011	1							0	-1
Richmond city, VA	0.0470	61	23	86					109	48
Richmond County, VA	0.0029	4	1	3					4	0
Roanoke city, VA	0.0221	29			2		25	3	30	1
Roanoke County, VA	0.0115	15					7	6	13	-2
Rockbridge County, VA	0.0046	6	1					8	9	3
Rockingham County, VA	0.0117	15			4			10	14	-1
Russell County, VA	0.0095	12					13		13	1
Salem city, VA	0.0040	5					1	2	3	-2
Scott County, VA	0.0097	13	2		12			2	16	3
Shenandoah County, VA	0.0067	9	2					8	10	1
Smyth County, VA	0.0104	14	10		3			7	20	6
Southampton County, VA	0.0052	7					7		7	0
Spotsylvania County, VA	0.0067	9	2						2	-7
Stafford County, VA	0.0051	7	1						1	-6
Staunton city, VA	0.0065	8			3			4	7	-1
Suffolk city, VA	0.0134	18					11		11	-7
Surry County, VA	0.0015	2			1				1	-1
Sussex County, VA	0.0037	5			4				4	-1
Tazewell County, VA	0.0124	16			8		12		20	4
Virginia Beach city, VA	0.0263	34		22			3		25	-9
Warren County, VA	0.0056	7	3						3	-4
Washington County, VA	0.0140	18	3		16			2	21	3
Waynesboro city, VA	0.0033	4			1			4	5	1
Westmoreland County, VA	0.0060	8	1		5				6	-2
Williamsburg city, VA	0.0014	2					1		1	-1
Winchester city, VA	0.0040	5	1						1	-4
Wise County, VA	0.0114	15	5		3			11	19	4
Wythe County, VA	0.0079	10	3		4			10	17	7
York County, VA	0.0033	4					1		1	-3
TOTALS:	1.0000	1304	266	300	349	27	223	139	1304	0

## PLAN FOR ACHIEVING EQUITABLE DISTIBUION

Virginia's plan for achieving equitable distribution (ED) focuses on those areas of the state with the most significant over or under service. Areas identified include jurisdictions served by AARP, NCOA, US Forest Service and the state program. For these identified areas we have developed a long-range plan with numerical goals to be achieved over a seven year period. Incremental progress toward achieving ED will be made over this time period.

### • RICHMOND CITY AND SURROUNDING COUNTIES

Background: Prior to July 1, 2004 SCSEP Title V services were provided in the Richmond metropolitan area by three grantees: the state, AARP, and Urban League. As a result of the competitive bidding process, Urban League did not receive a Title V grant and its Richmond City slots were awarded to AARP. This ensured that no participant lost a position.

The state program and AARP will move positions into surrounding counties over a seven year period as slots become available. The goal of the state program, the Capital Area Area Agency on Aging, Inc., is to transfer 18 positions from the city of Richmond to surrounding counties with the resulting slot distribution as follows:

Charles City County	4
Chesterfield County	5
Goochland County	3
Hanover County	9
Henrico County	9
New Kent County	2
Powhatan County	3
Richmond City	12

AARP's plan is to transfer 20 positions to two surrounding counties with the resulting slot distribution as follows:

Chesterfield County	15
Henrico County	28
Richmond City	86

The net effect of planned changes will be to substantially reduce overservice in Richmond City and to reduce underservice in Henrico and Chesterfield counties and other outlying counties.

#### NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Background: Overservice in Alexandria City resulted from NCOA's Alexandria program accepting Urban League's participants on July 1, 2003, when Urban League was eliminated as a Title V grantee. Additional slots were assigned to Alexandria to ensure that none of these participants would lose a position.

A gradual shift of slots from Alexandria City to Fairfax County and Prince William County is planned; a gradual shift of slots from Falls Church City and Fairfax City to Fairfax County is planned. NCOA's transfer plan would result in the following slot distribution:

Alexandria City	16
Fairfax City	2
Falls Church City	1
Fairfax County	24
Prince William County	10

The net effect would be to equitably serve Alexandria City and reduce underservice in the counties of Fairfax and Prince William.

#### • VALLEY/CENTRAL VIRGINIA

Background: Overservice in this area is not a result of DOL competition. There were no changes in the US Forest Service (USFS) slot awards as a result of the competition.

The US Forest Service will address overservice in Rockbridge County, Alleghany County, and to a lesser degree Bath County. USFS plans to make significant position reductions in Rockbridge County and will concentrate its efforts in that jurisdiction. USFS plans to increase its training and placement efforts in all three overserved jurisdictions and transfer positions through attrition. Positions will be filled from the underserved jurisdictions of Amherst, Augusta, Bedford, and Roanoke counties and the cities of Buena Vista, Lexington, Harrisonburg and Waynesboro. USFS's transfer plan would result in the following slot distribution:

6
2
11
4
3
2
3
5
4
1
1
4
2

Montgomery County	6
Page County	5
Page County	5
Radford City	1
Roanoke City	3
Roanoke County	6
Rockbridge County	8
Rockingham County	10
Salem City	2
Scott County	2
Shenandoah County	8
Smyth County	7
Staunton City	4
Washington County	2
Waynesboro City	4
Wise County	11
Wythe County	10

### TIDEWATER AREA

Background: As a result of DOL's national competition, AARP was awarded additional positions in the Norfolk/VA Beach/Chesapeake area and in the Hampton Roads areas. Some of these positions were formerly those of EW and NCOA.

AARP plans to gradually transfer eight slots from Norfolk City, an overserved area, to Chesapeake City which is underserved. This would result in the following slot distribution:

Chesapeake City	23
Norfolk City	50

NCOA plans to gradually transfer three positions from Franklin City to Suffolk City and Experience Works plans to transfer one position from Franklin City to Isle of White County. This would result in the following slot distribution:

Franklin City	EW - 3	NCOA - 1
Isle of Wight County	EW - 1	NCOA -5
Suffolk City		NCOA - 12

For those areas of the State that are less significantly over or under served, our plan is to transfer positions gradually from over served to under served jurisdictions. This will occur as positions become available through normal attrition. Changes will be made over a period of years as participants leave and slots become empty.

The state and all national sponsors operating in Virginia are committed to ensuring that participants will not lose positions as a result of transfer of slots.